

Shioya et al. in view of Yamazaki et al. '652 and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (US 6,445,005).

4. Claims 4, 13, 23 and 32 are rejected as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. and Shioya et al. in view of Yamazaki et al. '652 and further in view of Choi (US 6,583,577).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Examiner contends that Yamada teaches an insulating layer (14) formed on the driver transistor (12) and the selection transistor (13) and that Shioya teaches a transparent insulating film (227) formed on an EL display element.

However, neither Yamada nor Shioya (or the other cited references) teaches the claimed feature, “an insulating layer over the EL element and the applying means for applying an image signal to the EL element” or “an insulating layer over the EL element and the source driver circuit” of the independent claims of the present application. In particular, none of the cited references discloses or suggests an insulating layer over both the EL element and the applying means for applying an image signal to the EL element or the source driver circuit, as in the claims of the present application.

The Examiner contends that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the insulating film formed on the EL display element as taught by Shioya into the EL display of electronic device of Yamada et al. for producing the claimed invention because this would provide the light generated near the interface between the fourth organic layer and third organic layer, and allow injection of electrons into the third organic layer, and allow the white light traveling toward the color filter (col. 18, lines 48-56)” (emphasis added). The underlined part appears to be the Examiner’s reason, motivation or suggestion to combine the two references.

However, this alleged reason or function is only accomplished in Shioya by the entire

structure disclosed in Figs. 22 and 23 of the reference, which has many elements which do not appear to be disclosed or used in the device in Yamada. There is no indication or suggestion that transparent insulating film 227 can accomplish this function. Hence, there is nothing to indicate or suggest that even if the transparent insulating film 227 of Shioya was implemented into the EL display device of Yamada, that the above underlined function could be obtained. Therefore, this reason or suggestion to combine references to references to arrive at the claimed invention does not support this combination of references, and the rejection based thereon is improper.

Therefore, independent Claims 1, 9, 19 and 28 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, the rejection of these claims is improper, and Claims 1, 9, 19 and 28 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

Please charge our deposit account 50/1039 for any fee due for this amendment.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 18, 2007

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No.: 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO, CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.

200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568